Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/816,003	ARASE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Callie E. Shosho	1714
All Participants: Status of Application: Non-Final		
(1) <u>Callie E. Shosho</u> .	(3)	•
(2) <u>Gregory Stobbs</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 2 August 2007	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ If Yes, provide a brief description:	pplicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 1,12 Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE G See Continuation Sheet	ENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sur 	 The examiner will provide a writter rate record of the substance of the 	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
· ·		
Callie Shoho		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (App	licant/Applicant's Representative Sig	gnature – if appropriate)

t i 🗯

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner stated that the scope of each of claims 1 and 12 was confusing given that it is not clear what is meant by "a given pH range" or what values of pH are encompassed by such phrase. The examiner suggested amending the claims by inserting the limitation of claim 9 into claim 1 and the limitation of claim 17 into claim 12. The examiner also noted that claim 12, line 12 contained an inadvertant typing error and advised changing "missing" to "mixing" in line 12 of claim 12. However, in light of the examiner's time requirement for response to such suggestions, applicants were unable to agree to such changes in a timely manner.